

REMARKS

Claims 23-46 remain in the present application. Claims 1-3 and 6-16 are cancelled herein. Claims 31-46 are added herein. Claims 23 and 29-30 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully asserts that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim additions and amendments. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 23-29

Claims 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,115,074 to Ozkan et al. (hereafter referred to as “Ozkan”). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully asserts that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 23-29, and similarly recited in new Claims 32-41, are not rendered obvious by Ozkan for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 23 that recites a method of providing bitstream information comprising (emphasis added):

accessing a digital television bit-stream;
accessing a command requesting a table describing information in said digital television bit-stream, said command comprising:
 a plurality of attribute fields comprising:
 a table field for specifying a table identifier; and
 a multi-purpose field for specifying a select attribute related to a requested table; and
 a flag field for identifying said select attribute from a plurality of attributes held by said multi-purpose field;
determining if said flag field indicates a rating region table is requested, and if so, using information in said multi-purpose field to provide said rating region table;

determining if said flag field indicates an event information table is requested, and if so, using information in said multi-purpose field to provide said event information table; and
determining if said flag field indicates an extended text table is requested, and if so, using information in said multi-purpose field to provide said extended text table.

Independent Claim 32 recites limitations similar to independent Claim 23.

Claims 24-29 and 33-41 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “accessing a command requesting a table describing information in said digital television bit-stream” as recited in independent Claim 23. As recited and described in the present application, a command is generated for requesting a select table from a bit stream.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant understands Ozkan to teach that program specific information including a *predetermined set of tables* is sent *without a request* for one or more select tables. For example, Ozkan teaches that “program specific information is in the form of hierarchically arranged tables including an MGT, CIT, EIT, and ETT together with supplementary descriptor information” (col. 5, lines 34-36). Ozkan goes on to teach that the program specific information is directed to processor 60 for parsing, collation and assembly into tables (col. 3, lines 55-58). Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest that processor 60 requests such program specific information or a selected subset thereof (e.g., a select table as claimed). As such, Ozkan teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that program specific information *including a*

predetermined set of tables is *directed without a request* instead of accessing a command for requesting a select table from a bit stream as claimed.

The rejection suggests on page 11 that the setting of control register values by processor 60 is analogous to requesting a table as claimed. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Ozkan teaches that processor 60 uses control signal C to load packet identifiers (PID) in control registers of transport processor 22, where the PIDs identify the program specific information within the data stream (col. 5, lines 46-52). As such, the setting of control register values merely enables processor 22 to extract the program specific information from the data stream, but does *not* amount to a request for a select table from a bit stream as claimed for the reasons discussed above.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “said command field comprising... a plurality of attribute fields... and a flag field” as recited in independent Claim 23. As recited and described in the present application, a command for requesting a table from a bit stream comprises a plurality of attribute fields and a flag field.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant understands Ozkan to teach that program specific information including a predetermined set of tables is sent in response to receipt of a plurality of PIDs identifying packets of the programming specific information in a data stream. Applicant respectfully asserts that a PID is very different from a command comprising a plurality of attribute fields and a flag field as claimed. For example, Ozkan fails to teach or suggest that the PID is sent to request a table from a bit stream as claimed, as

discussed above. Further, Ozkan fails to teach or suggest that the PID has a plurality of attribute fields and a flag field as claimed.

Page 10 of the rejection suggests that Figures 2-6 of Ozkan teaches attribute fields as claimed. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Figures 2-6 of Ozkan show *tables compiled from* the program specific information extracted from the data stream instead of attribute fields of a *command used to request tables* from a bit stream as claimed. Thus, Applicant again asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest a command comprising attribute fields for requesting a table from a bit stream as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 23 is not rendered obvious by Ozkan, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claim 32 contains limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 23, independent Claim 32 also overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 24-29 and 33-41 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 24-29 and 33-41 are also not rendered obvious by Ozkan. Therefore, Claims 23-29 and 32-41 are allowable.

Claims 1-3, 6-16 and 30

Claims 1-3, 6-16 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan in view of United States Patent Number 6,546,419 to Humpleman et al. (hereafter referred to as "Humpleman"). Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully asserts that the embodiments of

the present invention as recited in Claims 1-3, 6-16 and 30, and similarly recited in new Claim 42, are not rendered obvious by Ozkan in view of Humpleman for the following reasons.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-3 and 6-16 herein. As a result, Applicant respectfully asserts that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection applied to Claims 1-3 and 6-16 is moot at this time.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 30, and similarly recited in new Claim 42, are not rendered obvious by Ozkan in view of Humpleman since both Ozkan and Humpleman fail to teach or suggest the limitations of “accessing a command requesting a table describing information in said digital television bit-stream” and “said command field comprising... a plurality of attribute fields... and a flag field” as recited in independent Claim 23 for the reasons discussed above. Since Claim 30 depends from independent Claim 23, and independent Claim 32 (from which Claim 42 depends) recites limitations similar to independent Claim 23, Claims 30 and 42 are therefore allowable.

New Claims 43-46

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to new independent Claim 43 that recites a data structure for identifying requested information from a multimedia bit stream comprising (emphasis added):

a flag field for specifying an information type of said requested information, said information type comprising at least one of programming information, rating information related to at least one geographic region, and extended text messages related to said bit stream; and
at least one attribute field for specifying an attribute of said requested information, said attribute identified by said information type

from among a plurality of attributes associated with said attribute field,
wherein each of said plurality of attributes is associated with a different
type of information of said multimedia bit stream; and
wherein said information type and attribute of said requested
information identify a table of said multimedia bit stream comprising said
requested information.

Claims 44-46 depend from independent Claim 43 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “a flag field for specifying an information type of said requested information” as recited in independent Claim 43. As recited and described in the present application, the data structure for requesting information from a bit stream comprises a flag field for specifying an information type of said requested information.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant understands Ozkan to teach that program specific information including a *predetermined set of tables* is sent *without a request* for one or more select tables as discussed above with respect to independent Claims 23 and 32. Since Ozkan teaches the extraction of information from a data stream without a request for the information, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan also teaches away from a flag field for specifying an information type of such requested information as claimed.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Humpleman, either alone or in combination with Ozkan, fails to cure the deficiencies of Ozkan discussed above with respect to independent Claim 43. Specifically, Humpleman also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “a flag field for specifying an information type of said requested information” as recited in independent Claim 43.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “at least one attribute field for specifying an attribute of said requested information” as recited in independent Claim 43. As recited and described in the present application, the data structure comprises at least one data field for specifying an attribute of requested information from a bit stream.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Ozkan of an attribute field for specifying an attribute of requested information from a data stream. Further, Ozkan fails to teach or suggest a request of information from a bit stream as claimed for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, it follows that Ozkan also fails to teach an attribute field for specifying an attribute of *requested* information as claimed.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Humpleman, either alone or in combination with Ozkan, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “at least one attribute field for specifying an attribute of said requested information” as recited in independent Claim 43. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant understands Humpleman to teach an attribute table whose attributes pertain to a device (Figure 11; col. 9, lines 53-55). As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that Humpleman teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching device attributes instead of attributes related to *requested information of a bit stream* as claimed.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “said attribute identified by said information type from among a plurality of attributes associated with said attribute field” as recited in

independent Claim 43. As recited and described in the present application, an information type is specified by a flag field of a data structure. The specified information type is used to identify an attribute associated with an attribute field, where the attribute is selected from a plurality of attributes associated with the attribute field.

As discussed above, Ozkan fails to teach or suggest attribute fields as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan also fails to teach a plurality of attributes associated with an attribute field. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan also fails to teach that an information type determined by a flag field is used to identify a select attribute from the plurality of attributes associated with the attribute field.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Humpleman, either alone or in combination with Ozkan, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “said attribute identified by said information type from among a plurality of attributes associated with said attribute field” as recited in independent Claim 43. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Humpleman as identification of a select attribute from a plurality of attributes associated with an attribute field.

And moreover, Humpleman teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that both attributes associated with an attribute field are used instead of identifying a select attribute from a plurality of attributes associated with an attribute field as claimed. For example, Figure 11 shows that the “DefaultSource” attribute field is defined by both “data type” and “default source device.” Humpleman teaches in lines 45-48 of column 10 that both attributes are

required to define the attribute field, thereby providing a total of four possible attribute field outcomes using two attribute fields with two attributes attributed to teach attribute field. As such, Humpleman teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that all attributes associated with an attribute field are to be used instead of selecting an attribute from those associated with the attribute field as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 43 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Ozkan and/or Humpleman. Since Claims 44-46 depend from independent Claim 43 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 44-46 are also allowable. Therefore, Claims 43-46 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 23-46 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 12/21, 2006

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060